

StCyr, Daniel

Subject: RE: RE:

Hello Examiner St.Cyr

I am responding to your voice message Friday as well as Tuesday regarding this appeal that you now have in front of you.

The appeal was filed in the first place because we could not reach agreement on the claims in the first place. Earlier, without filing a response to the appeal, you responded with office actions citing new prior art. Hence this appeal incorporates that art that you had cited. You also responded with notices of defects in the appeal. I have filed the appeal now pending before you after having correcting all such defects.

This appeal is now before you. We cannot come to an agreement on the claims in an attempt to dispose of this case before you as you would wish. I think the best course of action would be to file an examiner's response, allowing me to file a response to that and then allowing it to go before the board.

Thank you and with regards

Tara Singhal

----- Original Message -----

From: "StCyr, Daniel" <Daniel.StCyr@USPTO.GOV>
To: "Tara Singhal" <singhal@att.net>
Cc: "Lee, Michael G." <Michael.Lee@USPTO.GOV>
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2005 12:47 PM
Subject: RE: RE:

Mr. Singhal

No apologies are necessary. I really thought that I was helping you by suggesting certain language for the claims.
I should be apologizing to you for the misunderstanding.
Please send the corrective appeal brief to the proper channel so it can be properly processed.
Send the appeal brief to the receiving office. Do not email it to me.
Thank you.

-----Original Message-----

From: Tara Singhal [mailto:singhal@att.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2005 4:26 PM
To: StCyr, Daniel
Subject: Re: RE:

Daniel,

I apologize for any mis-understanding and or mis-communication. I whole heartedly agree that the appeal has to be right and the patent claims have to be valid. I thought we were going over old grounds. Hence my frustration.

I would send you by e-mail changes to the appeal brief that fix all the informalities that you stated in Oct. 05 notice to seek your concurrence that there are no issues in the appeal brief itself so that can then refile this corrected appeal brief.

Then you and I can decide how best to proceed.

Tara Singhal

----- Original Message -----

From: "StCyr, Daniel" <Daniel.StCyr@USPTO.GOV>
To: "Tara Singhal" <singhal@att.net>
Cc: "Lee, Michael G." <Michael.Lee@USPTO.GOV>
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2005 8:32 AM
Subject: RE:

Mr. Singhal

With all due respect, do not make it seems to my supervisor that I just don't want to send you case to the board.

We have talked about your case many times, you have asked to send the case to the board with all the informalities because you are not a registered agent or attorney, and I have told you that before the case can go to the board it must be cleared of the informalities.

Just because you are not a registered agent or attorney I can not and should not sent your case to the board with the informalities.

Ps.

Don't forget that you agreed to the suggested amendment to all the claims, except to cancel claims 72-74. And you have also asked me to rewrite the language of claims 72-74. See below.

Thank you.

-----Original Message-----

From: Tara Singhal [mailto:singhal@att.net]
Sent: Friday, September 30, 2005 10:30 AM
To: StCyr, Daniel
Subject: Re:

receipt printing with identification of contributions by merchant for a specific charitable cause of the shopper (charity benefactor) is an integral part of the invention, and is covered in many other dependent claims. Claims 72-74 cover it in independent claims. I am not prepared to cancel these claims.

Daniel, we have come along way. Hence, I would appreciate if you would suggest a rewrite on them. So that we could dispose of the case.

Thank you, Tara Singhal

----- Original Message -----

From: "StCyr, Daniel" <Daniel.StCyr@USPTO.GOV>
To: "Tara Singhal" <singhal@att.net>
Sent: Friday, September 30, 2005 6:38 AM
Subject: RE:

Claims 72-74 deal with receipt printing, which is totally different If you don't agree with the proposed amendment, let me know. I have to work on the case today. you can cancel these claims (72-74) and pursue then in a later date.

-----Original Message-----

From: Tara Singhal [mailto:singhal@att.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2005 8:11 PM
To: StCyr, Daniel
Subject: Re:

Suggest you also propose language that you would find acceptable for claims 72-74, like you did for others.

----- Original Message -----

From: "StCyr, Daniel" <Daniel.StCyr@USPTO.GOV>

To: <SINGHAL@ATT.NET>

Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2005 9:34 AM

This is different.

Cancel claim 72-74 and allow me to do an examiner amendment to allow the case.

You can just send me an email to confirm.

Thank you.

Daniel St.Cyr

Primary Examiner of 2876

571-272-2407